DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 187 SP 037 557

AUTHOR	Galvez-Martin, Maria Elena
TITLE	What Are the Needs of Substitute Teaching To Be Effective?
PUB DATE	1997-02-00
NOTE	31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (Washington, DC, February 17-19, 1997).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Techniques; *Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Substitute Teachers; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	Ohio; *Teacher Needs

ABSTRACT

The need to provide inservice training to substitute teachers was examined. The study surveyed a random sample of 278 teachers and 123 substitute teachers in Allen County, Ohio. The first part of the survey asked both groups about demographics. The second and third parts asked both groups whether teachers left complete lesson plans for substitutes, whether substitutes could follow the lesson plans, whether substitutes found resources available, what problems substitutes faced, and what areas required training for substitutes. Teachers alone discussed preparation for and satisfaction with substitutes, characteristics of good substitutes, and experiences with substitutes. Substitutes alone discussed how they had to improve instruction, what they did when there were no lesson plans, how they followed teachers' lesson plans, how they viewed their own level of preparation, their rationale for substituting, and grade levels and content areas in which they substituted. Results found little agreement between teachers' and substitutes' responses, particularly with regard to substitute and teacher training. Teachers were satisfied overall with how substitutes did their job, though problems were reported. Discipline was substitute teachers' main problem. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 412 187

9P

WHAT ARE THE NEEDS OF SUBSTITUTE TEACHING TO BE EFFECTIVE?

by

Maria Elena Galvez-Martin, Ph.D

The Ohio State University at Lima

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M E Galvez-Martin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Paper presented at the Annual ATE conference

Washington D.C., February 17-19, 1997

SP037557

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHAT ARE THE NEEDS OF SUBSTITUTE TEACHING TO BE EFFECTIVE?

Objective

The objective of this study is to determine the need to provide inservice training to those who are substitute teachers or to those that are starting in the teaching profession as substitute teachers.

Theoretical Framework

Substitute teaching has not been thoroughly studied as there are not many research studies in this area, and this is a need. Most of the publications that exist about substitute teaching do not have a research base. "Investigations which report simple data are as scant as systematic research efforts" (Collins, 1982, p. 232). Collins (1982) states that there is a need to gather information about the role that substitute teachers perform in the job and that researchers should be more concerned about the "teaching effectiveness of substitute teachers" (p. 232). "The greater clarity and definition provided to the substitute teaching role by institutions and educators, the more effective substitute teachers will be in the classroom. And that recognized teaching effectiveness will be witnessed in the learning acquired by students" (Collins, 1982, p. 232).

Substitute teachers exist because there is the need to replace regular teachers while absent. Therefore, it is highly important the effectiveness and efficiency of the substitute teachers' job. "Today, the demands for greater students achievement continue to increase, thereby raising the professional expectations of teachers. To meet these challenges, instruction time must be maximized, and those individuals who are asked to teach during the absence of the regular teacher must be equally effective in fulfilling the same roles (St. Michel, 1995, p. 5)..

Even though substitute teachers are considered to be "an invaluable resource and a vital

component of the schooling process"(St. Michel, 1995, p. 5-6), they are usually ignored by principals, teachers and students. (St. Michel, 1995). Substitute teachers receive very little support from the education community (Collins, 1982) but they are expected to perform efficiently and effectively a variety of tasks assigned to the teacher they are replacing (St.Michel, 1995). The role of the substitute teacher is awkwardly understood by teacher training institutions, regular classroom teachers, school administrators, and by the substitute teachers themselves (Collins, 1982). As substitute teachers have very little support by the community institutions and educators, "they have a limited model from which to base their teaching role. Greater support from others in the educational community will significantly help define their role. Additional efforts, however, must be made by the substitute teachers themselves. They must present themselves through statements and actions which not only stress quality preparation, but strong, well-founded teaching skills as well" (Collins, 1982, p. 231-232).

Substitute teachers are required to obtain a Substitute Teacher's Certificate which is valid to teach in the public school system. These certificates are issued to those who (1) have a valid teaching certificate, (2) have earned a bachelor's degree in any discipline (Ohio State Department of Education, 1996), or (3) have earned a minimum of 60 semester hours of college credit (Illinois State Board of Education, 1980). Therefore, not everyone who gets a Substitute Teacher's Certificate have the skills to be an effective substitute teacher. Corroborating the above mentioned, Koelling (1983) conducted a thorough survey of 1728 school districts, through which he concluded that 70% of the school districts do not require any professional training to be a substitute teacher, and 97% of the same school districts did not require any previous teaching experience.

Substitute teaching programs do not constitute a priority in the schools because substitute teachers are called only when they are needed, constituting in this way the "spare tire" (Warren, 1988, p. 96) of American education (Drake, 1981; Warren, 1988). Thus, they are not considered an important component withing the school system.

> "School districts need to make commitments to substitute teachers, affirming them as a necessary part of ongoing daily education. Districts must affirm that substitute teachers are more than "casual laborers", that they are teaching professionals who are expected to maintain and to extend the curriculum endorse by the district and planned by an absent teacher" (Collins, 1982, p. 231).

Substitute teaching programs if managed appropriately, "can provide valuable resources for the school staff and students and can make effective use of all classroom learning time" (George, 1991, p. 45). "A substitute teaching program is only as effective as the substitute teachers involved" (George, 1991, p. 45) and it will be good if the school is making it good. "School districts must provide substitute teachers with training and knowledge applicable to the district's diversity of classroom settings, the district's instructional goals, and the teaching materials and methods the district has adopted to realize its instructional goals" (Collins, 1982, p. 231). A substitute teacher who is not enthusiastic about teaching will be detrimental to the school's substitute teaching program (George, 1991).

George (1991) emphasizes that school administrators should screen candidates for substitute teaching "in an attempt to weed out incompetent teachers" (p. 45) by (1) interviewing candidates, (2) assess the personal qualities of the candidates, and (3) take into consideration the candidates'

expertise and areas of interest. In addition to the above, those substitute teachers whose evaluations are poor as well as their classroom management skills, and who do not follow the specified lesson plans should be screened out.

George (1991) suggests that schools should organize in late summer or early fall of the academic year that is starting a meeting with the potential substitute teachers. During this meeting, a packet of materials should be provided with a plan of the school, a map of the community, a copy of the school handbook (which includes policies and procedures), class and lunch schedules. Those in charge of the meeting should clarify any doubts that these substitute teachers could have, state school's expectations, and that "they will be expected to teach" (p. 46) because students spend an average of a week or week and half if not two weeks with substitute teachers per year.If substitute teaches are acting as babysitters and law enforcers, the students then are loosing at least one week or more of instruction.

George (1991) also suggests that in addition to the above mentioned meeting, the selected substitute teachers should be required to attend to a 7-10 week course in substitute teaching "as a part of the certification program for substitute teacher"(p. 46).

There are in fact some schools that require that substitute teachers attend faculty meetings, parent-teacher conferences and inservice training. In this way, substitute teachers become acquainted with the schools policies, the teachers, the students, and their parents. Effective substitute teaching is when substitute teachers are familiarized with the school system as well as its own teachers (George, 1991).

Methodology

This study was exploratory in nature. It was constituted by a survey which determined the needs of providing inservice training for substitute teaching in Allen County, Ohio

Subjects

The targeted population was constituted by all teachers and substitute teachers that work in Allen County, that is 1,215 (1,034 teachers and 181 substitute teachers). The representative sample was constituted by 401 teachers and substitute teachers (278 teachers and 123 substitute teachers) (see Table 1). The teachers and substitute teachers were randomly selected to reply the survey.

Table 1

Representative sample of teachers and substitute teacher from Lima City and Allen County schools

Subjects	Lima City	Allen County	Total
Teachers	139	139	278
Substitute Teachers	39	84	123
Total	178	223	401

Instrument

The survey was especially designed for this study. It had a set of common questions for both groups (teachers and substitute teachers) and there were a few questions that differ considering the

targeted group. The survey was divided in three parts. The first part of the survey directed to both groups asked demographic information such as gender, age, years teaching or substitute teaching and latest degree obtained. The second and third parts of the survey varied in length considering if it was directed to the teachers or to the substitute teachers. The survey directed to the teachers had six questions to be answered in a likert scale format, two yes/no questions, and five open-ended questions. The survey directed to the substitute teachers had four questions to be answered in a likert scale format, three yes/no questions, and seven open-ended questions.

The survey was validated by a group of classroom teachers and substitute teachers. These teachers (regular and substitute) went over the survey and answered it as if they were taking it. Then, a debriefing session took place where the teachers and substitute teachers gave feedback by suggesting questions to be added, changed, modified, rephrased, or improved. After all the modifications were implemented and appropriate revisions were made, the survey was applied during Spring Quarter of 1996.

Survey's Response Rate

The initial response rate of the survey was of 71%. The follow-up increased the overall response rate to 83%. Table 2 displays the response rate per group and area location.

Table 2

Survey's response rate of teachers and substitute teacher from Lima City and Allen County schools

Participants	Lima City	RR	Allen County	RR	Total	RR
Teachers	120	86%	130	94%	250	90%
Substitute Teachers	22	56%	62	74%	84	68%
Total	142	80%	192	86%	334	83%

RR = Response Rate

Survey's Participants

Of the subjects that participated in the study, Table 3 displays the demographic information.

Table 3

Survey's demographic information about the participating teachers and substitute teachers from Lima City and Allen County schools

Participants	Gender									
	Male		Female		N.A.		Total			
	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO		
Teachers	50	39	70	89	0	2	120	130		
Substitute Teachers	9	17	13	44	0	1	22	62		

Participants	Age															
	X		20's		30's		40's		50's		60's		70's		N.A.		Total	
	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO
Teachers	43	42	6	12	29	26	46	44	16	17	1	3	0	0	22	28	120	130
Substitute Teachers	38	39	8	17	4	10	4	16	4	6	1	3	0	1	1	8	22	62

Years Teaching/Substitute Teaching

Participants	X		<1		1-9		10-19		20-29		30-39		N.A.		Total	
	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO
Teachers	16	17	0	0	28	23	36	46	39	46	6	4	11	11	120	130
Substitute Teachers	4	4	4	7	15	49	1	4	0	1	0	0	2	1	22	62

Latest Degree Obtained

Participants	BA		BA+		BS		BS+		MA		Other		N.A.		Total	
	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO	LC	CO
Teachers	19	20	4	0	34	31	2	2	49	70	10	4	2	3	120	130
Substitute Teachers	6	13	1	0	10	37	1	0	4	9	0	2	0	1	22	62

N.A. = Not Answered
LC = Lima City
CO = Allen County
BA = Bachelor of Arts
BS = Bachelor of Science
BA+/BS+ = additional hours in graduate credit
MA = Master of Arts
Other = Other degrees obtained such as vocational, associates, M. Ed., M.S., D.M.A., Ph. D., B.F.A., M.B.A., Educational Specialist, and D.V.M.

Data Analysis

The first part of the survey corresponded to demographic information already presented above. The second part of the survey was analyzed quantitatively by applying One-Way-Anova to each item that figured under the likert scale format. The third part of the survey was analyzed qualitatively. Content analysis was applied to each open-ended question. The content of each open-ended question for each group (teachers and substitute teachers for Lima City and Allen County) was analyzed by two experienced raters on content analysis. Independently, they came up with categories for each question. After this analysis was performed, the raters compared the categories they came up with (which had arisen from the data), and they agreed in the categories that would be kept (peer debriefing). The percent of agreement was 95. Triangulation was performed between groups (teachers: city and county, and substitute teachers: city and county) on some questions of the survey (five questions of the second part and two questions of the third part). Triangulation was also performed within groups (teachers exclusively and substitute teachers exclusively) on other questions (six questions in the teachers' survey between city and county: three questions in the second part and three in the third part; and eight questions in the substitute teachers' survey between city and county: two in the second part and six in the third part).

The second part of the survey revealed that there were three questions addressed to both groups (shared questions), teachers and substitute teachers: (1) complete lesson plans left by the teacher, (2) substitute teachers being able to follow lesson plans, and (3) substitute teaching having and finding resources available. There were three questions which were addressed only to the teachers (individual questions): (1) teachers' satisfaction with the substitute's job, (2) preparing

students for the substitute teacher, and (3) provide the substitute teacher with a reminder list of things to do. The one question which was addressed only to the substitute teachers (individual question)was related with having to improve instruction.

The third part of the survey revealed that there were two open-ended questions addressed to both groups (shared questions), teachers and substitute teachers: (1) the problems substitute teachers face, and (2) the areas/topics in which substitute teachers should be trained. There were three individual open-ended questions which were addressed only to teachers (individual questions): (1) how the teachers are satisfied with the substitute teachers job, (2) the characteristics of a good/effective substitute teacher, and (3) the description of a good and bad experience with substitute teachers. There were five individual open-ended questions which were addressed only to substitute teachers: (1) what substitute teachers do when they do not find lesson plans available, (2) the way in which substitute teachers follow the teacher's lesson plans, (3) the level of preparation substitute teachers feel they have in terms of knowledge base, classroom management and discipline, and instruction and planning, (4) the grade levels and content areas in which they substitute teach, and (5) the rationale for substitute teaching.

Results

The overall means and standard deviations of averaged scores for each of the shared questions between groups are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4

Means and standard deviations of shared questions per groups and location

Participants	LC			CO			O		
	CLP	FLP	FRA	CLP	FLP	FRA	CLP	FLP	FRA
Teachers									
M	3.90	2.88	3.10	3.84	3.14	3.09	3.87	3.01	3.10
SD	0.53	0.72	0.56	0.69	0.81	0.61	0.61	0.77	0.59
Substitute Teachers									
M	3.09	3.32	2.81	3.16	3.08	2.64	3.12	3.20	2.73
SD	0.53	0.48	0.48	0.63	0.71	0.49	0.58	0.60	0.49

LC = Lima City
CO = Allen County
O = Overall
CLP = Complete lesson plans
FLP = Follow lesson plans
FRA = Find/have resources available

An examination of Table 4 revealed that the highest overall mean among the three questions on the teacher's response was the one associated to the question about CLP (complete lesson plans) (M = 3.87). It was the only means which was answered at the highest level within the survey's likert scale (always (= 4) complete lesson plans were provided to the substitute teachers). When comparing the teachers' and the substitute teachers' means responses, the strongest disagreement was observed

on the question about CLP (M = 3.87 versus M = 3.12 respectively), and a slight disagreement was observed on the question about FRA (finding resources available) (M = 3.10 versus M = 2.73 respectively).

A One-Way Anova was performed on each of the shared questions and a summary of the three questions' F and P values are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

One way ANOVAS F and P values of the shared questions between groups

Questions	F	P
CLP	29.56	0.0001
FLP	3.64	0.0132
FRA	11.42	0.0001

Note: For the three questions CLP, FLP and FRA, df = 3 and error = 330, total 333
CLP = Complete Lesson Plans
FLP = Follow Lesson Plans
FRA = Find/have Resources Available

An examination of Table 5 revealed that two of the three questions were statistically significant. The questions about CLP (complete lesson plans), where $F(1,333) = 29.56$, $p < .05$ and FRA (find/have resources available), where $F(1,333) = 11.42$, $p < .05$. This indicated that there was disagreement between the teachers' and the substitute teachers' responses to the questions about CLP

and FRA. The only question which was not statistically significant was the one associated with FLP (follow lesson plans). This was the only question where teachers and substitute teachers agreed in their responses.

The overall means and standard deviations of averaged scores for each of the individual questions within groups are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6

Means and standard deviations of individual questions within groups by location

Participants	LC				CO				O			
	TS	PS	PRL	II	TS	PS	PRL	II	TS	PS	PRL	II
Teachers												
M	2.48	3.20	3.82		2.84	2.90	3.71		2.66	3.04	3.76	
SD	0.67	0.96	0.52		0.70	1.00	0.75		0.71	0.99	0.65	
Substitute Teachers												
M				2.23				2.18				2.19
SD				0.69				0.62				0.63

LC = Lima City
CO = Allen County
O = Overall
TS = Teachers' Satisfaction
PS = Preparing Students
PRL = Providing a Reminder List
II = Improvise Instruction

An examination of Table 6 revealed that the highest overall means among the three individual questions which emanated from the teachers' survey was the ones associated to the question about PRL for Lima City and Allen County (M = 3.82 and M = 3.71, respectively). These were the only means which were answered at the highest level within the survey's likert scale (always (= 4) providing a reminder list of the things to do to the substitute teacher). It is worth mentioning that the lowest overall means among the individual question answered from the substitute teachers' survey was the one associated to the question about II for Lima City and Allen County (M = 2.23 and M = 2.18, respectively). These were the only means within the individual questions that were answered at the second lowest level within the survey's likert scale (sometimes (= 2) substitute teachers need to improvise instruction). When comparing the individual responses to the teachers' questions, the only disagreement was observed on the question about TS between the Lima City teachers and the Allen County teachers (M = 2.48 and M = 2.84, respectively).

A One-Way ANOVA was performed on each of the individual questions and a summary of the four questions' F and P values are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

One-way ANOVAS F and P values of individual questions within groups

Questions	F	P
TS	17.39	0.0001
PS	5.88	0.0160
PRL	1.75	0.1868
II	0.10	0.7520

Note: For the three individual questions from the teachers' survey, TS, PS, and PRS, df = 1, error = 248, total = 249. For the only individual question from the substitute teachers survey, II, df = 1, error = 82, total = 83.
TS = Teachers' Satisfaction
PS = Preparing Students
PRL = Providing a Reminder List
II = Improvise Instruction

An examination of Table 7 revealed that only one of the four individual questions was statistically significant. The question about TS (teachers' satisfaction about the substitute teachers' job), where $F(1,248) = 17.39$, $p < .05$. This indicated that there was disagreement between the Lima City and Allen County teachers' responses to the questions about TS. The other three individual questions were not statistically significant. Two of the three questions were the ones associated with PS (preparing students for the coming of the substitute teacher) and PRL (provide a reminder list of the things that have to be done by the substitute teacher). They indicated agreement on the teachers'

responses between Lima City and Allen County. The third question was the one associated with II (substitute teachers need to improvise instruction) and it also indicated agreement on the substitute teachers' responses between Lima City and Allen County.

There were two yes/no questions in the teachers' survey and three in the substitute teachers' survey. The first question was about the need of providing some training to substitute teach. The results of this analysis are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8

Need of some training for substitute teaching

Participants	Lima City				Allen County			
	Yes	No	N.A.	T	Yes	No	N.A.	T
Teachers	107	11	2	120	93	29	8	130
Percent	89	9	2	100	72	22	6	100
Substitute Teachers	13	9	0	22	28	30	4	62
Percent	59	41	0	100	45	48	7	100

N.A. = Not Answered
T = Total

An examination of Table 8 revealed that the majority of the responses of both groups of teachers (Lima City: 89% and Allen County 79%) agreed that substitute teachers need to receive

some kind of training in order to substitute teach more effectively. The results from the substitute teachers' responses did not seem to indicate the teachers' agreement in such a definite way because they were somewhat split as in Lima City, 59% agreed and 41% disagreed; and in Allen County, 45% agreed and 48% disagreed. These results seemed to indicate that meanwhile the teachers considered the training as an essential component for substitute teaching, substitute teachers not necessarily.

The second question was about the need to provide training to teachers on how to prepare materials for substitute teachers. The results of this analysis are displayed in Table 9.

Table 9

Need to train teachers in the preparation of materials for substitute teachers

Participants	Lima City				Allen County			
	Yes	No	N.A.	T	Yes	No	N.A.	T
Teachers	79	40	1	120	68	56	6	130
Percent	66	33	1	100	52	43	5	100
Substitute Teachers	17	5	0	22	50	9	3	62
Percent	77	23	0	100	81	14	5	100

N.A. = Not Answered
T = Total

An examination of Table 9 revealed that the majority of the responses of both groups of substitute teachers (Lima City 77% and Allen County 81%) agreed that the teachers should receive some kind of training in preparing materials for substitute teachers. The results from the teachers' responses did not have as high response as the substitute teachers'. It is worth mentioning that still the teachers' responses were relatively high (Lima City 66% and Allen County 52%). These results seemed to indicate that substitute teachers and teachers agreed in the need of training for teachers.

The third question was asked only in the substitute teachers' survey and it was related to the level of preparation substitute teachers feel they have for the job they perform. The results of this analysis are displayed in Table 10.

Table 10

Level of preparation substitute teachers have

Participants	Lima City				Allen County			
	Yes	No	N.A.	T	Yes	No	N.A.	T
Substitute Teachers	20	2	0	22	51	10	1	62
Percent	91	9	0	100	82	16	2	100

N.A. = Not Answered
T = Total

An examination of Table 10 revealed that the majority of the responses of the substitute teachers from Lima City and Allen County (91% and 82%) considered that they are prepared for the job.

In the second part of the survey, there were three open-ended questions in the teachers' survey and five in the substitute teachers' survey. Only two of those questions were asked to both, teachers and substitute teachers.

The first shared open-ended question by both groups was associated with the problems that substitute teachers face in the job. The results of this analysis are displayed in Table 11.

Table 11

Major problems substitute teachers face

Participants	Lima City F	Lima City %	Allen County F	Allen County %
Teachers				
Discipline and Classroom Management	176	56	159	49
Subject matter knowledge	30	10	41	13
Unfamiliar with school/classroom, routines/schedules, procedures /rules/policies	29	9	53	16
Substitute Teachers				
Discipline	41	63	100	50
No instructions/directions/lesson plans/schedule to follow	19	29		
Lack of administrative support	3	5		
Unfamiliar with school/classroom, routines/schedules, procedures /rules/policies			27	14
Incomplete/vague/unclear/non-existent planning			18	9

F = Frequency

An examination of Table 11 revealed that the three major problems which emanated from the content analysis performed on the teachers' responses were discipline and classroom management, subject matter knowledge and unfamiliarity with procedures. The only difference that was found in the analysis was that each group had them in a somewhat different order (Lima City: (1) discipline and classroom management, (2) subject matter knowledge and (3) unfamiliarity with procedures; and Allen County: (1) discipline and classroom management, (2) Unfamiliarity with procedures, and (3) subject matter knowledge. In both groups, the total percentage of the teachers' responses that corresponded to their frequencies was very high (Lima City: 75% and Allen County: 78%). In both groups, it was found that the major problem reported by the teachers was discipline. The three major problems that the content analysis revealed from the substitute teachers' responses was not consistent between the groups (Lima City and Allen County). For the Lima City substitute teachers, the three major problems were (1) discipline, (2) no instructions/directions/schedules/lesson plans to follow, and (3) lack of administrative support. For the Allen County substitute teachers, the three major problems were (1) discipline, (2) unfamiliarity with procedures, and (3) incomplete/vague/unclear/non-existent planning. In both groups, the total percentage of the substitute teachers' responses that corresponded to their frequencies was also very high (Lima City: 97% and Allen County: 73%The only problem was addressed by the two groups of substitute teachers was discipline. This seemed to indicate that the perception of the kind of problems that substitute teachers face is different, meanwhile between both groups of teachers, there was found consistency among their perception of the problems substitute teachers face. Throughout the four groups (teachers and substitute teachers from Lima City and Allen County) the only common major

problem was discipline and between the teachers (both groups) with the Allen County substitute teachers group, they also had in common unfamiliarity with procedures.

The second shared open-ended question by both groups was the one associated with the areas/topics in which substitute teachers could be trained. Three major areas were identified as a result of the content analysis. The content analysis revealed that from the teachers' survey, these major areas were (1) discipline and classroom management, (2) having a bag of tricks available and improvise, and (3) lesson planning. In both groups, the ranking of the areas for training was the same. In terms of percentages, the content analysis revealed the following: (1) discipline and classroom management:LimaCity 50% and Allen County: 48%, (2) having a bag of tricks available and improvise: 11% and 13% respectively, and (3) lesson planning: 9% and 11%. The results of the content analysis from the substitute teachers' responses was very similar to the first shared question. The major areas that emanated from the responses were different within and between groups. The three major areas that were revealed from the Lima City substitute teachers responses were: (1) discipline (34%), (2) course offerings (31%), and (3) what substitute teachers should do when plans are not available (24%). From Allen County, the substitute teachers responses were: (1) discipline (28%), (2) orientation for the job (18%), and (3) having a bag of tricks available and improvise (12%). The only common area between the teachers' and the substitute teachers' responses was discipline. The teachers' responses had also in common with the substitute teachers' responses from Allen County having a bag of trick available and improvise. These three major areas covered higher percentages within the teachers' responses (Lima City: 70% and Allen County: 72%) than within the substitute teachers' responses (Lima City: 89% and Allen County: 58%).

The teachers' survey contained three individual open-ended questions. The first open-ended question asked about how the teachers are satisfied with the substitute teachers' job. The content analysis revealed that 21% and 25% (Lima City and Allen County respectively) of the responses stated that they were just satisfied, 19% and 43% (Lima City and Allen County)stressed that substitute teachers do all what they are supposed to do such as follow lesson plans and directions left by them, grade papers, leave the room in order and a note in which they explained what they did and the problems that arose, and 20% and 17% (Lima City and Allen County respectively) mentioned that they were not satisfied as substitute teachers did everything they were not supposed to such as not following lesson plans and directions, not graded papers, left a messy room and no note was found about how the day went. These three categories, in both groups covered 76% in Lima City and 85% in Allen County of all the responses within each groups.

The second individual open-ended question was the one associated with the characteristics of a good/effective substitute teacher. The content analysis revealed three major categories that emanated from the teachers' survey and they were: (1) personal characteristics with 28% and 29% (Lima City and Allen County respectively) such as flexibility in adjusting to different situations, understand students, be kind but firm, fair and consistent, have a positive self-image and be self-confident, and have a strong personality among others, (2) be able to follow lesson plans, directions, routines and schedules, and school and classroom rules with 18% and 27% (Lima City and Allen County respectively), and (3) have good discipline with 18% and 20% (Lima City and Allen County respectively). These three categories covered 64% and 76% of all the responses within each group.These results seemed to indicate that there was consistency among the responses of the city

and county teachers.

The third open-ended question was the one associated with the teachers being asked to describe a good and a bad experience with subs. Within the good experience, 74% of the Lima City teachers and 57% of the Allen County teachers stated that for them a good experience was when substitute teachers followed lesson plans, left them a note about what happened in the day, graded papers, controlled discipline, and left the room in order.. Within the bad experience, there was no consistency among the teachers of Lima City and Allen County because 29% was related with the substitute teachers not being able to have no discipline in the classroom (Lima City) and 32% was related with the substitute teachers not following lesson plans and directions, not grading papers, not leaving a note and leaving the classroom a mess (Allen County).

There were five individual open-ended questions in the substitute teachers' survey. The first individual open-ended question was the one associated with what substitute teachers do when they do not find lesson plans available. Two categories emanated from the substitute teachers' survey and they were: (1) use bag of tricks to improvise with 33% and 30% (Lima City and Allen County) such as make up lesson plans, implement a game, and read stories; and (2) ask for help to teachers, students, and/or principal with 31% and 38% (Lima City and Allen County). These two categories covered 64% and 68% respectively of all the responses of each group. Even though the order by percentages was not the same between the groups (Lima City and Allen County), the results seemed to indicate that there was some consistency as the categories were the same in each group.

The second individual open-ended question was the one related to the way in which substitute teachers follows the teachers' lesson plans. The only major category that came up from

the data was being able to follow directions and instructions clearly stated in the lesson plans. It also includes following rules/procedures/policies of the classroom and school, and reviewing time schedules, routines, lesson materials and plans. This category obtained 74% that corresponded to Lima City and 57% to Allen County. These results indicated agreement and consistency within groups of substitute teachers.

The third individual open-ended question was the one associated with the level of preparation substitute teachers feel to have in terms of knowledge base, classroom management and discipline, and instruction and planning. The content analysis revealed three major categories that emanated from the substitute teachers' survey and they were: (1) well prepared with 68% and 44% (Lima City and Allen County, respectively), (2) not well prepared out of their certification with 10% and 16% (Lima City and Allen County, respectively), and (3) experience has helped to be better prepared with 8% and 26% (Lima City and Allen County, respectively). These three categories covered 86% of all of the responses of each group. Even though the order by percentages was not the same in both groups (Lima City and Allen County), the results seemed to indicate some consistency as the categories were the same in each group.

The fourth individual open-ended question was the one associated with the grade levels and content areas in which they substitute teach. This analysis revealed that 36% and 34% substitute teach in grades K-12 (Lima City and Allen County) and 18% in grades K-8 and 7-12 (Lima City and Allen County, respectively). These results covered 54% and 52% (respectively) of all the responses of each groups. In terms of content areas, in Lima City 50% substitute teach in all content areas and 18% in specials such as special education, art, music, health, P.E. among others.. In Allen County,

it was only reported that 52% substitute teach in specials. These results seem to indicate that most of the substitute teachers surveyed substitute teach in grades K-12.

The fifth individual open-ended question was the one associated with the rationale for substitute teaching. The only major category that emanated from the content analysis was looking for a full-time position with 55% and 29% (Lima City and Allen County. These results seemed to indicate that those who are substitute teaching are doing so meanwhile they obtain a full-time position.

Conclusions and Implications

(1) Most of the teachers' responses showed consistency and agreement, meanwhile there was disagreement among the substitute teachers' responses and by those provided by the teachers. Therefore, there were very few questions where agreement took place between groups.

(2) Teachers agreed that substitute teachers need training and substitute teachers mostly agreed.

(3) Teachers and substitute teachers consistently agreed that teachers also need training in the preparation of materials for substitute teachers.

(4) The major problem substitute teachers face is discipline.

(5) Teachers reported that overall they are satisfied when substitute teachers do their job.

(6) Teachers consider that personal characteristics make substitute teachers effective.

(7) Substitute teachers need to have available a bag of tricks to implement in case there are no plans.

(8) Substitute teachers considered that they are well prepared to perform their job effectively.

(9) Mostly, substitute teachers are placed in all grade levels.

(10) Most of substitute teachers are looking for a full-time position meanwhile they are in this job.

The results of this study showed that there is an urgent need to do more research studies in this area in order to support substitute teachers to do an effective job. There were some contradictions found between the agreement from substitute teachers of providing training to both (substitute teachers and teachers) and the reports of substitute teachers who state that they are well prepared for the job and teachers who report that as far as substitute teachers do their job, they are satisfied with their performance. In addition to the above, if substitute teachers were that well prepared, there should not be such a variety of negative experiences with substitute teachers.

Considering the results of this study, substitute teachers programs should be organized by school districts which could be worked in partnerships with colleges and universities. Within this partnerships, teams of teachers and college/university professors could collaborate to provide a sound training for substitute teachers. It is well known that the pay to substitute teachers is low, therefore, school districts together with colleges and universities could provide a service that could generate credit for the substitute teachers who attend these programs. These programs could be made mandatory to be hired by school districts.

Bibliography

Collins, SH. (1982). Substitute teaching: A clearer view and definition. The Clearinghouse, 55 (5), 231-232.

Drake, J.M. (1981). Making effective use of the substitute teacher: An administrative opportunity. NASSP, 65 (September), 74-80.

Friedman, N.L. (1983). High school substituting: Task demands and adaptations in educational work. Urban Education, 18 (winter), 114-116.

George, P.L.(ed.) (1991). How to improve your substitute teaching program. In NASSP (National Association of Secondary School Principals) Tips for Principals, Reston, VA.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1980). Minimum requirements for state certificates. Springfield, IL: ERIC document (ED 207 979).

Koelling, C.H. (1983). Substitute teachers: School policies and procedures in the north central region. Education, (winter), 155-171.

McIntire, R.G. & Hughes, L.W. (1982). Houston program trains effective substitutes. Phi Delta Kappan, 64 (June), 702.

Pronin, B. (1983). Substitute teaching: A handbook for hassle-free subbing. New York: St. Martin's Press.

St. Michel, T. (1995). Effective substitute teachers: Myth, mayhem, or magic? Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.

Warren, R. (1988). Substitute teachers ---education's relief pitchers. NASSP, 72 (512), 96-99